

REMARKS

By this Response, claims 1, 8, 10 and 11 have been amended. No further claims have been added or canceled. Claims 1, 2, 4-12, and 14-21 are pending. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 11 can be found throughout the as-filed specification and claims, in particular at paragraphs [0035], [0038], and [0040]. No new matter has been added.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants are pleased to note the Examiner's indication of allowable claim 21. In addition, the Examiner objected to claims 4-8 and 14-18 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but identifies these claims as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Responsive to the Examiner's objection, it is respectfully submitted that at least independent claims 1 and 11 are currently allowable over the applied reference, without incorporating the subject matter of allowable dependent claims therein. Support for Applicants' position follows.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 9-12 and 19-20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 9-12 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Alfred et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0187808). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The subject matter of claims 1 and 11 are directed to methods comprising, *inter alia*, determining a total cost estimate of one or more products; determining a difference in cost between products, and generating a cost differential report according to the estimated total cost for each product; and displaying the report, for example a cost savings calculations on a graphical display.

It is the Examiner's position that *Alfred et al.* disclose the features of the claimed invention, including "determining a difference in cost, and generating a cost differential report according to the estimated total cost for each product", referring to at least paragraph [0016] thereof.

To the contrary, it is respectfully submitted that *Alfred et al.* fail to teach or suggest the combination of "determining a total cost for one or more products", "determining a difference in cost between products" and "generating a cost differential report". Instead, *Alfred et al.* determine a total cost for a single product, including, for example, markup on that product, but do not further compare that product cost to another product cost as claimed. In distinction, the presently claimed invention enables a comparison between products rather than an estimate for a single product. Thus, *Alfred et al.* also do not generate a cost differential report or provide viewing of such a report.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, 9-12 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants further respectfully submit that claims 2, 9, 10; and 12, 19-20 are in condition for allowance, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 1 and 11, respectively.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention is not rendered obvious in view of the cited references applied against this application. Applicants therefore request the Examiner's reconsideration of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 50-2961.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3-7-2008

By: Barbara A. Fisher
Barbara A. Fisher
Reg. No. 31,906

MH2 TECHNOLOGY LAW GROUP LLP
1951 KIDWELL DRIVE, SUITE 550
TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182
TEL: 703.917.0000 x 121